The authors of the Mont-ford Report suggested that the Governor should remain President of the Provincial Legislative Council, and that in the case of the Central Legislature, the Council of State should be presided over by the Governor General himself and the Legislative Assembly by a President nominated by the Governor General.

The Joint Select Committee who considered this question very carefully were, however, of opinion that the Governor should not preside. They advised that, for a period of four years, the President should be appointed by the Governor and that wherever possible, it would be a great advantage if some one could be found for that purpose who had had parliamentary experience. The Committee attributed the greatest importance to the question of the Presidency of the legislative council. They stated that it would "in their opinion conduce very greatly to the successful working of the new councils if they were imbued from the commencement with the spirit and conventions of parliamentary procedure as developed in the Imperial Parliament".

Provision was accordingly made under sections ~~63A~~, 63B, and 72 C, of the Government of India Act, 1919 for the President of the Legislative Assembly being appointed by the Governor-General for the first four years and by the Governors for the first four years of the provincial legislative councils.

D0 9
C, P-4

In pursuance of these provisions, active or retired Members of the Governors' Executive Councils

were.appointed as Presidents of the Legislative Councils of some of the Provinces. In the case of the Legislative Assembly, Sir Fredrick Whyte, a distinguished member of the House of Commons, was appointed by the Governor-General to be the first President. Sir Frederick Whyte was succeeded in 1925 by Mr. V.J. Patel, a prominent member of the Swarajist party who was elected by the Assembly.

The Indian Statutory Commission who enquired into the working of the system of Government in British India in all its aspects made the following observations with regard to the Presidential Chair at Delhi:-

> "In nothing is the contrast between Westminster and Delhi more striking than in the position assumed, and the influence exercised, by the occupant of the Chair of the Assembly. He claims, and employs, powers of interference which would be quite contrary to the stricter limits of the Speakership -- reprimanding a government member of the Council of State for not attending and speaking at a debate in the Lower House, advising the Government not to proceed with important business when the Swarajists walked out, explaining his view of the proper operation of the so-called Fiscal Convention, and so forth. We are bound to make plain the difference, lest it should be supposed that the traditions and the methods of the Speaker of the House of Commons were being reproduced in the Indian Legislature. The explanation of the contrast, we venture to think, is not unconnected with the fact that, whereas in the House of Commons there is always a government majority which may be depended upon to support the authority of the Speaker, any majority upon which the President of the Assembly may be disposed to lean, is necessarily found in the ranks of the Opposition. It is not to be presumed or expected that the spirit of British parliamentary institutions can be transplanted and reproduced automatically in so different an atmosphere, and there are many other models for the Speakership besides the model at Westminster. Lord Bryce described one in his book on the American Constitution, and the student of comparative institutions may find there a much closer parallel to the practice of the President of the Legislative Assembly."

The Committee on Constitutional Reform in Mysore thought that it was high time to give the Legislative Council the privilege of having its own President outside the Executive to preside over its deliberations and regulate business. They proposed therefore in para 187 of their report that the Council should in future have a non-official President elected by the House itself subject to the approval of His Highness the Maharaja, but as the conduct of business in a deliberative assembly was a task which required experience, they recommended that for the first term the President may be nominated by His Highness the Maharaja.

This recommendation was accepted by the Government in Para 48 of their order on the report of the Reforms Committee. It is accordingly provided by sub-section (1) of Section 16 of the Government of Mysore Act, 1940, that there shall be a President of the Legislative Council, who shall, until the expiration of four years from the first meeting thereof, be a person appointed by His Highness the Maharaja, and shall thereafter be a member of the Legislative Council elected by the Legislative Council and approved by His Highness the Maharaja.